

CHANNEL ISLANDS NATIONAL MARINE SANCTUARY SANCTUARY ADVISORY COUNCIL

MEETING HIGHLIGHTS

Wednesday May 23, 2001

12:00 – 5:15 pm

and

6:30 – 10:00 pm

**Victoria Hall
Santa Barbara, CA**

The following is a brief summary of highlights from the May 23, 2001 meeting of the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary Advisory Council (SAC), and is not intended to replace meeting minutes. Upon approval by the SAC, final meeting minutes will be posted on the CINMS website at: www.cinms.nos.noaa.gov/sacmin.html.

IMPORTANT: The next SAC meeting is on **Tuesday, June 19th**. Despite an extensive search for a meeting venue in Ventura, we were not able to find an appropriately-sized facility available on 6/19. Therefore, we will be holding the meeting at Warren Hall, Earl Warren Showgrounds, Santa Barbara. A draft meeting agenda will be sent to you soon.

Attendance:

- At roll call, 20 of the 20 voting seats were represented, and two of the three non-voting seats. There was a total of 34 SAC representatives in attendance for the day (16 members, 16 alternates, 2 non-voting reps).
- During the afternoon, public attendance peaked at about 100, while the evening public forum was attended by approximately 300.

Administrative & Announcements:

- The Council unanimously approved the February 9th SAC meeting minutes.
- June 19 was set by the Council as a deadline for offering comments on draft minutes of the March 14th SAC meeting, which were distributed at the meeting.
- Dianne Meester announced the following changes in membership on the SAC:
 - Larry Manson has been appointed as Education member
 - Kathy deWet-Oleson has been appointed as Education alternate (Kathy introduced herself)

- Dr. Robert Warner has been appointed as Research member
- Walt Schobel has been appointed by Vandenberg Air Force Base as the SAC's Department of Defense alternate (effective as of the June 19 SAC meeting)
- Rebecca Roth has been appointed to the California Coastal Commission member seat (Rebecca introduced herself; Gary Timm will now serve as the SAC's Coastal Commission alternate)
- In the interest of saving time, Matt Pickett reviewed one item from the Manager's Report: response by the National Marine Sanctuary System to the Navy's proposal to operate SURTASS LFA sonar in and near National Marine Sanctuaries (see Manager's Report for details)

Marine Reserves:

- SAC Chair Dianne Meester and MRWG Co-Chairs Matt Pickett and Patty Wolf, thanked the MRWG, Science Panel, and Socio-Economic Panel for their efforts and contributions over the past two years. Plaques were given to each participant present from each of the three groups.
- John Jostes, MRWG lead facilitator, provided a "Facilitator's Report" presentation on the MRWG. John stepped the Council through highlights found in the 37-page report, highlighting significant areas of agreement achieved and disagreement encountered by the MRWG.
- Council discussion immediately following John's report raised questions and responses about: whether or not the MRWG would have benefited from more time; the need for clarity about the final "composite map" (areas of "overlap" and "non-overlap"); how the SAC could use the information provided to go forward; the difficulty the SAC would have in trying to "finish" maps.
- Sean Hastings provided the Council with a brief report on the role of the public in the MRWG process. In addition to highlighting the public's role at meetings and public forums, Sean handed out a one-page summary of written comments received to date (over 9000 comments). Sean also shared a few copies of a draft Print Media Coverage report that includes 55 articles written about the marine reserves process since January 2000. The draft report is available to SAC members for review, and will be updated and finalized in the coming months.
- Satie Airame provided a presentation to the SAC that recapped the Science Panel's involvement in the marine reserves process. [NOTE: CINMS will work to get this presentation posted on the Sanctuary's web site]. Satie highlighted: the "ecosystem/biodiversity" and "sustainable fisheries" goals given to the Science Panel (SP) by the MRWG; the ecological framework used by the SP to develop recommendations; the approach taken by the SP to establish optimal size ranges to recommend for reserves; the difference between sizing of reserves for fisheries sustainability vs. biodiversity conservation; how the SP evaluated reserve location factors (i.e. biogeographic provinces, connectivity, depth, coastline types, sediment types, vulnerable habitats, species of interest to the MRWG, existing monitoring sites); the modeling used by the SP to generate ranges of "solutions" for optimal placement of

reserves. Regarding the role of the SP in reviewing draft maps developed by the MRWG, Satie explained how the scientists analyzed maps A, B, C, D, E, and I, including suggested improvements the SP had suggested to the MRWG. Satie concluded by showing and explaining summary slides that compared the SP analysis of all six MRWG maps.

- Questions from the SAC for Satie raised discussion on issues such as: the need to be clear on the SP recommendation supporting 30-50% closures (i.e. 30-50% of what); the fact that different habitat criteria were not “weighted” differently; the appearance that the SP was not focused on trying to solve a known fisheries management problem; the understanding that while the SP was not asked to evaluate the MRWG’s final composite map, the previous analyses done by the SP on maps E and I comes quite close to understanding the final map.
- Bob Leeworthy provided a presentation to the SAC that recapped the Socio-Economic Panel’s involvement in the marine reserves process. [NOTE: CINMS will work to get this presentation posted on the Sanctuary’s web site]. Bob highlighted: the MRWG’s socio-economic goals and objectives; the difference in roles between the SP and the Socio-Economic Panel (SEP); the user groups addressed in the study; the user groups for which there was no available data (e.g. non-consumptive activities by private boaters, passive use/non-use value of CINMS); the role of the MRWG’s Fishermen’s Data Review Committee and how the SEP worked with confidential data; various maps highlighting consumptive use (e.g. squid value distribution, charter boat fishing, private household fishing activity, consumptive diving activity); what was measured (e.g. ex-vessel values connected to employment models, consumer surplus or net value); what was provided to the MRWG (overview of local economies, data distributions and exclusion zones, step 1 analysis of maps A, B, C and D). Bob’s final overhead displayed summary totals for maximum potential loss/benefit by sector for maps A, B, C and D.
- Questions from the SAC for Bob raised discussion on issues such as: understanding that the percentage estimates of impact totals were relative to activities within CINMS, not industry-wide; reasoning why “net effects” to industries cannot always be extrapolated from the data collected on CINMS activities; concerns and disappointment that so much of the data came forth late in the process, and that more and better data is out there; additional explanation of and concerns about the concept of measuring the “non-use value” of marine reserves within CINMS;
- Jon Clark offered a motion, seconded by Dianne Meester, that the SAC thank and formally disband the MRWG, relieving them from further duties. The motion was approved unanimously.
- Council members engaged in discussion for about one hour concerning what actions the SAC should consider taking next. Issues and ideas discussed included: consideration of the SAC looking at maps C and I and how they might be changed to create a single map that meets the MRWG’s goals for marine reserves; suggestions that the SAC not “punt” by merely passing along everything the MRWG came up with; the fairness of the MRWG process relative to contributions made by commercial vs. recreational fishing interests; concern about trying to finish what the MRWG could not complete; the suggestion that

CINMS and DFG might now craft a reserve recommendation that draws on the work of the MRWG and its technical panels, and the current CDFG uncertainly as to the likelihood of this happening; discussion about the role of the Pacific Fisheries Management Council and CINMS with respect to implementing no-take reserves in federal sanctuary waters.

- MRWG members in attendance were given an opportunity to address the Council. The following members spoke:
 - Bob Fletcher commented that he strongly disagreed with the Science Panel recommendations, noting that it seemed to overwhelm the use of all other management tools in a non-crisis situation. He warned that following the advice of the Science Panel would bring economic injury to many people, and urged the SAC to look beyond the advice of the Science Panel.
 - Steve Roberson said that he would be disappointed if there was not a SAC recommendation on marine reserves. Steve also commented that there was no question on the MRWG about the need for some reserves at the islands. He urged the SAC not to “roll over” the opportunity to the state’s Marine Life Protection Act.
 - Greg Helms explained how MRWG members were not really supposed to possess outright veto power in the negotiations. Greg commented that he did not think the SAC could do now what the MRWG couldn’t accomplish in two years, and suggested that the SAC should act to forward the MRWG’s information and findings to CINMS but not tamper with the maps. Outside of the MRWG process, Greg said, there is a continuing interest among many of the participants to continue work on narrowing differences. He suggested that the SAC should give Matt Pickett and Patty Wolf the opportunity to keep working on the recommendation.
 - Harry Liquornik reminded Matt Pickett and Patty Wolf that this is a community-based process, and he, like Greg, would like to continue to work on this.
 - Shawn Kelly urged the SAC to follow the best available science regarding marine reserves, and to respect that there are federal and state laws that support such an approach. Shawn added that marine reserves are a fisheries management tool, and suggested that what is needed now is for a clear step to be taken with implementation of reserves that then can allow other evolving management approaches to adapt.
 - Michael McGinnis explained his reasoning for leaving the MRWG in February, 2001, noting that he suspected special interest groups would generally dominate the process. He strongly urged the SAC to stand behind the science today, suggesting that it would be enough to begin the long process of protecting the ecosystem.
- Chris Henson from the office of Lois Capps read a letter from the Congresswoman. (all SAC representatives will receive a copy)

Public Forum:

- Approximately 300 people attended the evening public forum
- John Jostes, MRWG lead facilitator, provided a “Facilitator’s Report” presentation to the audience. John traced the history and process of the MRWG, and highlighted significant MRWG areas of agreement and disagreement. The public was provided with a summary handout that described the process and summarized the MRWG’s mission, problem statement, goals, implementation recommendations, and unresolved issues (reserve size, reserve location, use of limited take areas, relative weighting of advice from Science Panel and Socio-Economic Panel, phasing of reserves over time, integration of reserves into existing fisheries management). The public’s handout also provided the final MRWG “composite map,” a list of MRWG and technical panel members, and information on future meetings.
- The public comment period provided 79 individuals with 2 minutes each to speak.
- A very general breakdown of SAC suggestions and main points raised is as follows:
 - 25 comments urging the SAC to specifically support the Science Panel’s 30-50% marine reserve recommendation
 - 18 comments generally urging the SAC to act by supporting marine reserves
 - 10 comments urging the SAC to specifically recommend Map B
 - 4 comments asking that free diving be respected as a sustainable fishery, and exempted from reserves
 - 3 comments urging SAC to recommend a marine reserve proposal of at least 50% closure area
 - 2 comments suggesting that “small” reserves or the MRWG “areas of overlap” be implemented first, and then monitored for performance
 - 1 comment suggesting that the SAC recommend a marine reserve proposal of 40-45% closure area
 - 1 comment suggesting that the SAC forward a proposal on the three western islands, noting that ACI and SBI were not dealt with
 - 1 comment suggesting that the SAC forward only Maps E and I
 - 1 comment suggesting that two islands be closed and two left open
 - 1 comment suggesting the SAC forward three proposals: a SP-endorsed map, the MRWG areas of overlap map, and a map that the SAC likes
 - 1 comment suggesting the SAC should forward only what it received from the MRWG and technical panels
 - 1 comment expressing concern about unfair impacts on recreational fishermen
 - 1 comment suggesting that methods other than marine reserves be considered
 - 1 comment suggesting that more work should be done on artificial reefs
 - 1 comment suggesting the SAC ask for more time to work on this
 - 1 comment expressing concerns about enforcement issues
 - 1 comment expressing concerns about the validity of the science used
 - 1 comment asking the SAC to remember this evening as a clear mandate to act
- In addition to the oral testimony, 93 written comments were deposited in the public comment box. (all written comments on the marine reserves process are housed at the CINMS office in Santa Barbara, are available for SAC member review at any time.)

If you have questions about any of the meeting materials or highlights, please contact me at (805) 884-1464.